



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/524,491	03/13/2000	Francis J Maguire JR.	313-011-1	6120

4955 7590 06/12/2007
WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS &
ADOLPHSON, LLP
BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 5
755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224
MONROE, CT 06468

EXAMINER

SHAPIRO, LEONID

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2629

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/12/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/524,491
Filing Date: March 13, 2000
Appellant(s): MAGUIRE, FRANCIS J

MAILED

JUN 12 2007

Technology Center 2600

Keith R. Obert
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 02.08.07 appealing from the Office action
mailed May 23, 2006.

(1) Real Party in Interest

The real party in interest in this appeal is Francis J. Maguire, Jr., a citizen of the United States of America.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

Park (US Patent No. 5,695,406); Helman (US Patent No. 5,791,735).

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

1. Claims 1-15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Park (US Patent No. 5,695,406).

As to claim 1, Park teaches apparatus, comprising:

a support for supporting a user in reclining position (See Fig. 6A, Col. 7, Lines 24-35);

and a movable headrest (Fig. 2, items 16, 24, Col. 6, Lines 43-46 and Fig. 1g, items 12 (Notice that headrest 24 rigidly attached to relaxation base 12)) mounted on support (in the reference motion base) (Fig. 1C, items 14, Col. 5, Lines 39-50), for moving with rotational movements with respect to support (Fig. 1C, items 14), and supporting a head of user in executing rotational movements (See Figs. 1a-1d, items 12 14, Col. 9, Lines 46-47) while viewing images from changing directions (See Col. 9, Lines 47-50).

As to claims 3-4, 7 Park teaches headrest (Fig. 1B, items 12, 16, Fig. 2, item 24) is movable by actuator (See Figs. 1a-1d, items 15, 50, Col. 9, Lines 46-63).

As to claim 2, 5-6, 11-12, Park teaches a display (Fig. 2, item 20) and sensor (See Fig. 1C, items 12, 14, Col. 10, Lines 23-24) for providing images for viewing from changing direction (See Fig. 2, items 16, 20, Col. 6, Lines 31-39).

As to claim 8, Park teaches apparatus, comprising:

Art Unit: 2629

a sensor coupled to a moveable headrest for supporting a user's head with respect to support (See Fig. 1, items 12, 14, 16), responsive to head movements of the user (See Fig. 1, items 12, 16), for providing a sensed signal having a magnitude indicative of differing directions-of-view corresponding to said head movements (Notice, that in order to produce visual stimuli coordinated with rotational movement of relaxation base with headrest relative to the motion base inherently must be sensor detecting those rotational movements) (See Figs. 1a-1d, 2, items 12, 14, 24, Col. 10, Lines 23-27);

a reality engine (external computer), responsive to said sensed signal, for providing an image signal indicative of a sequence of images from differing directions-of-view selected according to said sensed signal and corresponding thereto (See Col. 10, Lines 29-34); and

a display, responsive to said image signal, for providing said sequence of images for viewing by said user from said differing directions-of-view (See Fig. 2, item 20, Col. 6, Lines 31-39).

As to claim 9, Park teaches apparatus, comprising:

a reality engine (external computer), responsive to a start command signal, for providing an image signal indicative of a sequence of images from differing directions-of-view selected according to said sensed signal and corresponding thereto (See Col. 10, Lines 29-34); and

a display, responsive to said image signal, for providing said

Art Unit: 2629

sequence of images for viewing by said user from said differing directions-of-view (See Fig. 2, item 20, Col. 6, Lines 31-39).

an actuator (Fig. 1D, items 15), responsive to actuator command signal, for moving a headrest (Fig. 2, items 16, 24 and Fig. 1C, items 12, 16) with respect to a support (Fig. 1c, item 14) with said headrest supporting a user's head (Fig. 2, items 16, 24 and Fig. 1C, items 12, 16) with movements respect to said support (Fig. 1c, item 14) corresponding to different directions-of-view (See Figs. 1a-1d, items 15, 50, Col. 9, Lines 46-63).

As to claim 10, Park teaches apparatus, comprising: a headrest (Fig. 1C, Items 12, 16) and a support (motion base) (Fig. 1C, item 14) for supporting a user in a reclining posture (See Fig. 6A, Col. 7, Lines 24-35) with a head of user resting on headrest (Fig. 1C, Items 12, 16) mounted on support (motion base) (Fig. 1C, item 14); headrest with movable headrest for supporting head of the user in executing head movements in a changing of head of user (See Figs. 1a-1d, items 12, 16 (Notice that headrest 24 rigidly attached to relaxation base 12), 14, Col. 9, Lines 46-47), a viewing images provided from a correspondingly changing direction of view (See Col. 9, Lines 47-50), head and headrest moving together (Fig. 1C, items 12, 16) in changing direction with respect to support (motion base) (See Fig. 1C, item 14).

As to claim 13 Park teaches relaxation base (Fig. 1B, items 12, 16, Fig. 2, item 24) with headrest (Fig. 2, items 16, 24) is movable by actuator (See Figs. 1a-1d, items 15, 50, Col. 9, Lines 46-63).

Art Unit: 2629

As to claims 14-15, Park teaches support is continuously positionable (See Fig. 1D, items 15, 50, Col. 9, lines 27-63).

2. Claims 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park as applied to claims 1, 8-10 above, and further in view of Helman (US Patent No. 5,791,735).

Park does not disclose left and right rotational movements, left and right directions.

Helman teaches left and right rotational movements, left and right directions of headrest (See Col. 3, Lines 15-21).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide left, right rotation (changes in directions) in Park system in view of teaching of Helman in order to support user's head (See Col. 3, Lines 15-19).

(10) Response to Argument

On page 5, 2nd paragraph of Appeal brief, Applicant's stated in relation to independent claim 1 that the motion base 14 does not correspond to the support recited in claim 1, because the motion base 14 is not for supporting a user viewing images in a standing, seated, or reclining posture. However, Park teaches a support for supporting a user in reclining position (fig. 6A, item 12, col. 7, lines 24-35).

On page 6, 1st paragraph of Appeal brief, Applicant's stated in relation to

independent claim 1 that the motion base 14 by itself is unsuitable for supporting the subject. However, Park teaches a support for supporting a user in reclining position (fig. 6A, item 12, col. 7, lines 24-35).

On page 6, last paragraph of Appeal brief, Applicant's stated in relation to independent claim 1 that the headrest 24 is not movable relative to the relaxation chair 12, because the display hood 16 is attached to the relaxation chair. However, hood 16 with headrest 25 rigidly attached to the to the relaxation base 12 and moved relative to the motion base 14 (in the reference support is equivalent to the motion base and headrest is a combination of hood, headrest and relaxation base) (See Abstract and Fig. 1C, items 12, 14, 16, Col. 5, Lines 39-50).

Notice, that in Description Applicant's used Park reference as example (See Page 5, Lines 32-34 in the Specification).

On page 9, 4th paragraph of Appeal brief, Applicant's stated, that there is no motivation to combine the Helman reference with Park reference since Park shows a rigidly attached headrest to the relaxation base. However, combining the Helman reference with Park reference will give additional (relative to the movement of the motion base) movement capability 14 to the user.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning (page 9, last paragraph of Appeal brief), it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the

Art Unit: 2629

claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).


(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Leonid Shapiro



Examiner

AU 2629

March 6, 2007



RICHARD HJERPE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Conferees:

Richard Hjerpe



SPE

AU2629

Michael Razavi



SPE

Application/Control Number: 09/524,491

Page 9

Art Unit: 2629

AU2629